

Serial No. 09/896,085

Daneman et al. that have mirrors that rotate about a common axis. To this end, the Office Action cites MEMS devices 212 and 224 that have mirrors that rotate about a common axis.

Applicants agree that the mirrors of MEMS devices 212 and 224 rotate about a common axis.

Nevertheless, such agreement notwithstanding, the simple presence of MEMS devices that rotate about a common axis is not sufficient to meet applicants' claims' limitations. This is because applicants' claims require "a first imaging system optically coupled to said first MEMS device so as to produce an image of each of said micro mirrors of said first MEMS device on a corresponding micro mirror of said second MEMS device".

However, despite the Office Action's suggestion to the contrary, in Daneman et al., the mirrors of MEMS devices 212 and 214 are not coupled by an imaging system. Instead, only the mirrors of MEMS device 212 are combined with the mirrors of MEMS device 214 via imaging system 216 between them as a first group, and only the mirrors of MEMS devices 222 are combined with the mirrors of MEMS device 224 via imaging system 226 between them as a second group. (See Daneman et al., column 4, lines 24-43.) It therefore follows that the mirrors of MEMS device 212 are not be combined with the mirrors of MEMS device 224 as suggested by the Office Action. Nor is there any suggestion that the mirrors of MEMS device 214 can be combined by an imaging system with the mirrors of MEMS device 222.

Applicants acknowledge that mirrors of MEMS devices 212 and 214 can be optically coupled, because light from MEMS device 212 eventually passes to MEMS device 214. However, such simple optical coupling is not sufficient to meet what is recited in applicants' claims, which, as noted, requires a specific type of optical coupling, namely, that there be produced an image of each of said micro mirrors of said first MEMS device on a corresponding micro mirror of said second MEMS device and moreover, that such image be formed so that the resulting overall effective angle different than either of the angles of reflection MEMS devices when neither one of the angle of reflections is zero. There is no image formed by the simple optical coupling of MEMS devices 212 and 214 in Daneman et al., nor does any combination of angles result thereby.

Serial No. 09/896,085

Indeed then, the fact that Daneman et al. teaches the use of an imaging system to combine MEMS devices that have mirrors that rotate about orthogonal axes, yet does not teach to so combine the MEMS devices which are disclosed as having mirrors that rotate about the same axis, shows that Daneman et al. actually teaches away from applicants' invention as claimed.

Thus, there is no teaching or suggestion in Daneman et al. of combining angles about a common axis using an imaging system as recited in applicants' claims. Therefore, applicants' claims are allowable over Daneman et al. under 35 U.S.C. 102.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 9, 10, 14, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,330,102 issued to Daneman et al. on December 11, 2001.

This ground of rejection is for dependent claims only, and is predicated on the ability to maintain the rejection above under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) given Daneman et al. Since the rejection above under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Daneman et al. has been overcome, and the no additional elements are provided by Daneman et al. or suggested in the Office Action regarding the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), this ground of rejection cannot be maintained, because the rejected claims depend from independent claims which are allowable.

Therefore, claims 9, 10, 14, 28, and 29 are allowable over Daneman et al. under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Serial No. 09/896,085

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, he is invited to call applicant's attorney so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

In the event that an extension of time is required for this amendment to be considered timely, and a petition therefor does not otherwise accompany this amendment, any necessary extension of time is hereby petitioned for, and the Commissioner is authorized to charge the appropriate cost of such petition to the **Lucent Technologies Deposit Account No. 12-2325.**

Respectfully,

D. T. Neilson
R. Ryf

By Eugene J. Rosenthal
Eugene J. Rosenthal, Attorney
Reg. No. 36,658
732-949-1857

Lucent Technologies Inc.

Date: 5/7/04